

REMARKS

CLAIMS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-15, 18-21, 24-37 are pending. Claims 1, 18, 21, 34, and 35 have been amended, claims 10-15 and 36-37 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and no new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1, 3-7, 9, 18-21, 24-35 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

ART BASED REJECTIONS

In the final office action, claims 1-3, 9-15, 18-21, 23-34 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Getting Results with Microsoft Office Results 97 pages 448-457, 563-573, and new pages 169-178 (collectively hereafter Office Results 97). Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable presumably over Office Results 97. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Office Results 97 in view US patent application publication number 2004/0075683 (hereafter "Savage"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1 reads as follows:

accessing a relational abstraction of a data store, the relational abstraction including a plurality of views, scalar or aggregate fields associated with the views, relations between the views, and a metadata layer that includes one or more objects that contain properties describing the data store, the views, the fields, and the relations;

receiving an indication of a base view from among one or more views in the relational abstraction; and

providing a user interface for creating a customized report that includes at least one drill link₁

wherein creating the customized report comprises

including fields constrained by the base view, and

Type of Response: Amendment

Application Number: 10/765,232

Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01

Filing Date: 01/26/2004

providing the at least one drill link on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view.

Several of these recited features are not disclosed or suggested by the applied references.

Specifically, there is no disclosure in Office Results 97 of the (1) creation of a base view from among one or more views in the relational abstraction. Nor does Office Results 97 disclose or suggest an interface for creating a customized report (2) in which the fields are constrained by the base view and (3) and a drill link is constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view. None of these features are disclosed or suggested by the applied references. As disclosed in the specification, a user selected base view is becomes the entry point into the relational abstraction and is used to constrain which fields are displayed for selection by a user and which relations of the relational abstraction (i.e., a relation path) can be followed to select the fields including the field designated as drill link. See, for example, page 14, lines 1–12; page 23, lines 4–20; page 31, line 14 to page 33, line 13.

As noted in the office action, Office Results 97 discloses displaying pivot table views of a database but this does not disclose receiving an indication of a base view from among one or more views in *a relational abstraction* that includes not only *a plurality of views, scalar or aggregate fields associated with the views, relations between the views,* and but also *a metadata layer that includes one or more objects that contain properties describing the data store, the views, the fields, and the relations.*

Furthermore, the office action states that “Office teaches a wizard for generation of a pivot table report which has a drop down button to discover the data hidden in a database.” However, this disclosure of Office Results 97 does not disclose or suggest anything to do with either a drill link being constrained by the metadata layer of the

Type of Response: Amendment

Application Number: 10/765,232

Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01

Filing Date: 01/26/2004

relational abstraction (for example by a flag setting) or that it is based upon a relation path from the base view. In fact, there is simply no discussion in Office Results 97 of either the drill link being constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction nor is there any discussion of the relation path from a base view and its use in providing a drill link in a customized report. In this context it should be noted that the metadata layer includes one or more objects that contain properties describing the data store, the views, the fields, and the relations (but are not the views or data store themselves). That is, generating a pivot table report based on the view itself (as disclosed by Office Results 97) does not disclose anything corresponding to the claimed drill link being constrained by a separate metadata layer of the relational abstraction as recited in independent claim 1. Nor is there anything in the disclosure of Office Results 97 which corresponds to the drill link being based upon a relation path from a base view.

It should be noted that *silence* in a reference is not a proper basis for asserting that reference either anticipates or renders obvious a claimed feature. The Federal Courts have held for a long time that The Patent Office (PTO) has the burden of proving each of the claimed features is shown by the prior art. An allegation that claimed subject matter is “obvious” requires a positive, concrete teaching in the prior art, such as would lead a person skilled in the art to choose the claimed combination from among many that might be comprehended by broad prior art teachings. The PTO’s review court has made it very clear that silence in a reference is hardly a substitute for clear and concrete evidence from which a conclusion of obviousness might justifiably flow. See, e.g., *Application of Burt*, 356 F.2d 115, 121 (CCPA 1966).

Accordingly, several of the features recited in independent claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by the applied references. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to patentable over the applied references.

Independent claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, an interface for creating a first report containing at least one drill link, wherein creating the first report comprises including

Type of Response: Amendment

Application Number: 10/765,232

Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01

Filing Date: 01/26/2004

only fields constrained by a base view in the relational abstraction, and providing the at least one drill link on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view. As discussed earlier herein with respect to claim 1, Office Results 97 does not disclose or suggest anything related to creating a first report including only fields constrained by a base view in the relational abstraction and nor does it disclose providing the at least one drill link on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction and based upon a relational path from the base view. Since these recited features are not disclosed by any of the applied references, independent claim 21 is believed to be patentable over the applied references.

Independent claims 34 recites a system that includes, *inter alia*, the means for providing a user interface for creating a report comprises means for including only fields constrained by a base view in the relational abstraction, and means for providing the at least one drill link only on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view. As discussed earlier herein, Office Results 97 does not disclose or suggest any means for including only fields constrained by a base view in the relational abstraction, and means for providing the at least one drill link only on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction and based upon a relation path from the base view. Since these recited features are not disclosed by the applied references, independent claim 34 is patentable over the applied references.

Independent claim 35 recites a system that includes, *inter alia*, that the means for providing a user interface for creating a first report comprises (i) means for including only fields constrained by a base view in the relational abstraction, and (ii) means for providing the at least one drill link only on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view. As discussed earlier herein none of the applied references disclose or suggest any means for

Type of Response: Amendment

Application Number: 10/765,232

Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01

Filing Date: 01/26/2004

including only fields constrained by a base view in the relational abstraction, and means for providing the at least one drill link only on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction and based upon a relation path from the base view.

Accordingly, independent claim 35 is patentable over the applied references.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment

Application Number: 10/765,232

Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01

Filing Date: 01/26/2004

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: January 18, 2008

By: /Aaron C. Chatterjee/

Aaron C. Chatterjee, Reg. No.: 41,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 7067453
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

January 18, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004